

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the applications were improperly rejected; plaintiffs would be irreparably injured absent an injunction; the potential harm to defendants was outweighed by plaintiffs' injuries; and an injunction was in the public interest. Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction was granted. Defendants were ordered to process the applications received from			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the organization to determine whether those registrants were qualified to vote. Furthermore, defendants were enjoined from rejecting any voter registration application on the grounds that it was mailed as part of a "bundle" or that it was collected by someone not authorized or any other reason contrary to the NVRA.			
Moseley v. Price	United States	300 F. Supp. 2d	January 22, 2004	Plaintiff alleged, that	The court concluded that	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia	389; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 850		defendants' actions in investigating his voter registration application constituted a change in voting procedures requiring § 5 preclearance under the Voting Rights Act, which preclearance was never sought or received. Plaintiff claimed he withdrew from the race for Commonwealth Attorney because of the investigation.	plaintiff's claim under the Voting Rights Act lacked merit. Plaintiff did not allege, as required, that any defendants implemented a new, uncleared voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting. Here, the existing practice or procedure in effect in the event a mailed registration card was			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint.	returned was to "resend the voter card, if address verified as correct." This was what precisely occurred. Plaintiff inferred, however, that the existing voting rule or practice was to resend the voter card "with no adverse consequences" and that the county's initiation of an investigation constituted the implementation of a change that had not been pre--cleared.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					The court found the inference wholly unwarranted because nothing in the written procedure invited or justified such an inference. The court opined that common sense and state law invited a different inference, namely that while a returned card had to be resent if the address was verified as correct, any allegation of			

015377

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					fraud could be investigated. Therefore, there was no new procedure for which preclearance was required. The court dismissed plaintiff's federal claims. The court dismissed the state law claims without prejudice.			
Thompson v. Karben	Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Second Department	295 A.D.2d 438; 743 N.Y.S.2d 175; 2002 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 6101	June 10, 2002	Respondents filed a motion seeking the cancellation of appellant's voter registration and political party enrollment on the ground that	Respondents alleged that appellant was unlawfully registered to vote from an address at which he did not reside and that he should	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>appellant was unlawfully registered to vote in a particular district. The Supreme Court, Rockland County, New York, ordered the cancellation of appellant's voter registration and party enrollment. Appellant challenged the trial court's order.</p>	<p>have voted from the address that he claimed as his residence. The appellate court held that respondents adduced insufficient proof to support the conclusion that appellant did not reside at the subject address. On the other hand, appellant submitted copies of his 2002 vehicle registration, 2000 and 2001 federal income tax returns, 2002 property tax bill, a May</p>			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					2001 paycheck stub, and 2000 and 2001 retirement account statements all showing the subject address. Appellant also testified that he was a signatory on the mortgage of the subject address and that he kept personal belongings at that address. Respondents did not sustain their evidentiary burden. The judgment of the trial court was reversed.			
Nat'l Coalition	United	2002 U.S.	August 2,	Plaintiffs, a	The court	No	N/A	No



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
v. Taft	States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	Dist. LEXIS 22376	2002	nonprofit public interest group and certain individuals, sued defendants, certain state and university officials, alleging that they violated the National Voter Registration Act in failing to designate the disability services offices at state public colleges and universities as voter registration sites. The group and individuals moved for a	found that the disability services offices at issue were subject to the NVRA because the term "office" included a subdivision of a government department or institution and the disability offices at issue were places where citizens regularly went for service and assistance. Moreover, the Ohio Secretary of State had an obligation under the NVRA to designate the			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				preliminary injunction.	disability services offices as voter registration sites because nothing in the law superceded the NVRA's requirement that the responsible state official designate disability services offices as voter registration sites. Moreover, under Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3501.05(R), the Secretary of State's duties expressly included			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ensuring compliance with the NVRA. The case was not moot even though the Secretary of State had taken steps to ensure compliance with the NVRA given his position to his obligation under the law. The court granted declaratory judgment in favor of the nonprofit organization and the individuals. The motion for a preliminary			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					injunction was granted in part and the Secretary of State was ordered to notify disabled students who had used the designated disability services offices prior to the opening day of the upcoming semester or who had pre--registered for the upcoming semester as to voter registration availability.			
Lawson v. Shelby County	United States Court of Appeals for the	211 F.3d 331; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS	May 3, 2000	Plaintiffs who were denied the right to vote when they	Plaintiffs attempted to register to vote in October, and	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Sixth Circuit	8634		refused to disclose their social security numbers, appealed a judgment of the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee at Memphis dismissing their amended complaint for failure to state claims barred by U.S. Const. amend. XI.	to vote in November, but were denied because they refused to disclose their social security numbers. A year after the election date they filed suit alleging denial of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities, the Privacy Act of 1974 and § 1983. The district court dismissed, finding the claims were barred by U.S. Const. amend. XI, and the one			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

---

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					year statute of limitations. The appeals court reversed, holding the district court erred in dismissing the suit because U.S. Const. amend. XI immunity did not apply to suits brought by a private party under the Ex Parte Young exception. Any damages claim not ancillary to injunctive relief was barred. The court also held the statute of limitations ran from the date plaintiffs			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					were denied the opportunity to vote, not register, and their claim was thus timely. Reversed and remanded to district court to order such relief as will allow plaintiffs to vote and other prospective injunctive relief against county and state officials; declaratory relief and attorneys' fees ancillary to the prospective injunctive relief, all permitted under			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the Young exception to sovereign immunity, to be fashioned.			
Curtis v. Smith	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas	145 F. Supp. 2d 814; 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8544	June 4, 2001	Plaintiffs, representatives of several thousand retired persons who called themselves the "Escapees," and who spent a large part of their lives traveling about the United States in recreational vehicles, but were registered to vote in the county, moved for preliminary injunction seeking to	Before a general election, three persons brought an action alleging the Escapees were not bona fide residents of the county, and sought to have their names expunged from the rolls of qualified voters. The plaintiffs brought suit in federal district court. The court issued a	No	N/A	No



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				enjoin a Texas state court proceeding under the All Writs Act.	preliminary injunction forbidding county officials from attempting to purge the voting. Commissioner contested the results of the election, alleging Escapees' votes should be disallowed. Plaintiffs brought present case assertedly to prevent the same issue from being relitigated. The court held, however, the issues were different, since,			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					unlike the case in the first proceeding, there was notice and an opportunity to be heard. Further, unlike the first proceeding, the plaintiff in the state court action did not seek to change the prerequisites for voting registration in the county, but instead challenged the actual residency of some members of the Escapees, and such challenge			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					properly belonged in the state court. The court further held that an election contest under state law was the correct vehicle to contest the registration of Escapees. The court dissolved the temporary restraining order it had previously entered and denied plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction of the state court proceeding.			
Pepper v. Darnell	United States Court	24 Fed. Appx. 460;	December 10, 2001	Plaintiff individual	Individual argued on	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	2001 U.S. App. LEXIS 26618		appealed from a judgment of the district court, in an action against defendant state officials seeking relief under § 1983 and the National Voter Registration Act, for their alleged refusal to permit individual to register to vote. Officials had moved for dismissal or for summary judgment, and the district court granted the motion.	appeal that the district court erred in finding that the registration forms used by the state did not violate the NVRA and in failing to certify a class represented by individual. Individual lived in his automobile and received mail at a rented box. Officials refused to validate individual's attempt to register to vote by mail. Tennessee state law forbade			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					accepting a rented mail box as the address of the potential voter. Individual insisted that his automobile registration provided sufficient proof of residency under the NVRA. The court upheld the legality of state's requirement that one registering to vote provide a specific location as an address, regardless of the transient lifestyle of the			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					potential voter, finding state's procedure faithfully mirrored the requirements of the NVRA as codified in the Code of Federal Regulations. The court also held that the refusal to certify individual as the representative of a class for purposes of this litigation was not an abuse of discretion; in this case, no representative party was available as the			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					indigent individual, acting in his own behalf, was clearly unable to represent fairly the class. The district court's judgment was affirmed.			
Miller v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	348 F. Supp. 2d 916; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24894	October 27, 2004	Plaintiffs, two voters and the Ohio Democratic Party, filed suit against defendants, the Ohio Secretary of State, several county boards of elections, and all of the boards' members, alleging claims under the	Plaintiffs alleged that the timing and manner in which defendants intended to hold hearings regarding pre-election challenges to their voter registration violated both the Act and the Due Process	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				National Voter Registration Act and § 1983. Plaintiffs also filed a motion for a temporary restraining order (TRO). Two individuals filed a motion to intervene as defendants.	Clause. The individuals, who filed pre-election voter eligibility challenges, filed a motion to intervene. The court held that it would grant the motion to intervene because the individuals had a substantial legal interest in the subject matter of the action and time constraints would not permit them to bring separate actions to protect their rights. The			



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					court further held that it would grant plaintiffs' motion for a TRO because plaintiffs made sufficient allegations in their complaint to establish standing and because all four factors to consider in issuing a TRO weighed heavily in favor of doing so. The court found that plaintiffs demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits because they made a			

015397

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					strong showing that defendants' intended actions regarding pre-election challenges to voter eligibility abridged plaintiffs' fundamental right to vote and violated the Due Process Clause. Thus, the other factors to consider in granting a TRO automatically weighed in plaintiffs' favor. The court granted plaintiffs' motion for a TRO. The court			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Voter Registration Cases

---

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					also granted the individuals' motion to intervene.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
James v. Bartlett	Supreme Court of North Carolina	359 N.C. 260; 607 S.E.2d 638; 2005 N.C. LEXIS 146	February 4, 2005	Appellant candidates challenged elections in the superior court through appeals of election protests before the North Carolina State Board of Elections and a declaratory judgment action in the superior court. The court entered an order granting summary judgment in favor of appellees, the Board, the Board's executive director, the Board's members, and the North Carolina Attorney General. The candidates appealed.	The case involved three separate election challenges. The central issue was whether a provisional ballot cast on election day at a precinct other than the voter's correct precinct of residence could be lawfully counted in final election tallies. The superior court held that it could be counted. On appeal, the supreme court determined that state law did not permit out--of--precinct provisional	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots to be counted in state and local elections. The candidates failure to challenge the counting of out-of-precinct provisional ballots before the election did not render their action untimely. Reversed and remanded.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	387 F.3d 565; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 22320	October 26, 2004	Defendant state appealed from an order of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio which held that the Help America Vote Act required that voters be permitted to cast	The district court found that HAVA created an individual right to cast a provisional ballot, that this right is individually enforceable under 42	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				provisional ballots upon affirming their registration to vote in the county in which they desire to vote and that provisional ballots must be counted as valid ballots when cast in the correct county.	U.S.C.S. § 1983, and that plaintiffs unions and political parties had standing to bring a § 1983 action on behalf of Ohio voters. The court of appeals agreed that the political parties and unions had associational standing to challenge the state's provisional voting directive. Further, the court determined that HAVA was quintessentially about being able to cast a provisional			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>ballot but that the voter casts a provisional ballot at the peril of not being eligible to vote under state law; if the voter is not eligible, the vote will then not be counted.</p> <p>Accordingly, the court of appeals reversed the district court and held that "provisional" ballots cast in a precinct where a voter does not reside and which would be invalid under state law, are not required by the HAVA to be considered</p>			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					legal votes. Affirmed in part and reversed in part.			
State ex rel. Mackey v. Blackwell	Supreme Court of Ohio	106 Ohio St. 3d 261; 2005 Ohio 4789; 834 N.E.2d 346; 2005 Ohio LEXIS 2074	September 28, 2005	Appellants, a political group and county electors who voted by provisional ballot, sought review of a judgment from the court of appeals which dismissed appellants' complaint, seeking a writ of mandamus to prevent appellees, the Ohio Secretary of State, a county board of elections, and the board's director, from disenfranchisement of provisional ballot voters.	The Secretary of State issued a directive to all Ohio county boards of elections, which specified that a signed affirmation statement was necessary for the counting of a provisional ballot in a presidential election. During the election, over 24,400 provisional ballots were cast in one county. The electors' provisional	No	N/A	No



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots were not counted. They, together with a political activist group, brought the mandamus action to compel appellants to prohibit the invalidation of provisional ballots and to notify voters of reasons for ballot rejections. Assorted constitutional and statutory law was relied on in support of the complaint. The trial court dismissed the complaint, finding that no clear legal right was established			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under Ohio law and the federal claims could be adequately raised in an action under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983. On appeal, the Ohio Supreme Court held that dismissal was proper, as the complaint actually sought declaratory and injunctive relief, rather than mandamus relief. Further, election--contest actions were the exclusive remedy to challenge election results. An adequate remedy existed			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under § 1983 to raise the federal-law claims. Affirmed.			
Fla. Democratic Party v. Hood	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida	342 F. Supp. 2d 1073; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21720	October 21, 2004	Plaintiff political party sought injunctive relief under the Help America Vote Act, claiming that the election system put in place by defendant election officials violated HAVA because it did not allow provisional voting other than in the voter's assigned precinct. The officials moved for judgment on the pleadings.	The political party asserted that a prospective voter in a federal election had the right to cast a provisional ballot at a given polling place, even if the local officials asserted that the voter was at the wrong polling place; second, that voter had the right to have that vote counted in the election, if the voter otherwise	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					met all requirements of state law. The court noted that the right to vote was clearly protectable as a civil right, and a primary purpose of the HAVA was to preserve the votes of persons who had incorrectly been removed from the voting rolls, and thus would not be listed as voters at what would otherwise have been the correct polling place. The irreparable injury to a voter was easily sufficient to			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>outweigh any harm to the officials. Therefore, the court granted relief as to the first claim, allowing the unlisted voter to cast a provisional ballot, but denied relief as to the second claim, that the ballot at the wrong place must be counted if it was cast at the wrong place, because that result contradicted State law. The provisional ballot could only be counted if it</p>			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					was cast in the proper precinct under State law.			
League of Women Voters v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	340 F. Supp. 2d 823; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20926	October 20, 2004	Plaintiff organizations filed suit against defendant, Ohio's Secretary of State, claiming that a directive issued by the Secretary contravened the provisions of the Help America Vote Act. The Secretary filed a motion to dismiss.	The directive in question instructed election officials to issue provisional ballots to first-time voters who registered by mail but did not provide documentary identification at the polling place on election day. When submitting a provisional ballot, a first-time voter could identify himself by providing his driver's license number or the	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					last four digits of his social security number. If he did not know either number, he could provide it before the polls closed. If he did not do so, his provisional ballot would not be counted. The court held that the directive did not contravene the HAVA and otherwise established reasonable requirements for confirming the identity of first-time voters who registered to vote by mail because: (1) the			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					identification procedures were an important bulwark against voter misconduct and fraud; (2) the burden imposed on first--time voters to confirm their identity, and thus show that they were voting legitimately, was slight; and (3) the number of voters unable to meet the burden of proving their identity was likely to be very small. Thus, the balance of interests favored the directive,			



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					even if the cost, in terms of uncounted ballots, was regrettable.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	386 F.3d 815; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 28765	October 23, 2004	Defendant Ohio Secretary of State challenged an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, which held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive 2004--33 violated the federal Help America Vote Act. In its order, the district court directed the Secretary to issue a revised directive that conformed to HAVA's requirements.	On appeal, the court held that the district court correctly ruled that the right to cast a provisional ballot in federal elections was enforceable under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 and that at least one plaintiff had standing to enforce that right in the district court. The court also held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					2004--33 violated HAVA to the extent that it failed to ensure that any individual affirming that he or she was a registered voter in the jurisdiction in which he or she desired to vote and eligible to vote in a federal election was permitted to cast a provisional ballot. However, the district court erred in holding that HAVA required that a voter's provisional ballot be counted as a			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					valid ballot if it was cast anywhere in the county in which the voter resided, even if it was cast outside the precinct in which the voter resided.			
Hawkins v. Blunt	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21512	October 12, 2004	In an action filed by plaintiffs, voters and a state political party, contending that the provisional voting requirements of Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430 conflicted with and was preempted by the Help America Vote Act, plaintiffs and defendants, the secretary of state and others, moved	The court held that the text of the HAVA, as well as its legislative history, proved that it could be read to include reasonable accommodations of state precinct voting practices in implementing provisional voting requirements.	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				for summary judgment.	The court further held that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430.2 was reasonable; to effectuate the HAVA's intent and to protect that interest, it could not be unreasonable to direct a voter to his correct voting place where a full ballot was likely to be cast. The court also held that plaintiffs' equal protection rights were not violated by the requirement that before a voter would be allowed to cast a provisional			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballot, the voter would first be directed to his proper polling place.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	340 F. Supp. 2d 802; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20551	October 13, 2004	Plaintiffs, state and county Democratic parties, filed an action against defendant, Michigan secretary of state and the Michigan director of elections, alleging that the state's intended procedure for casting and counting provisional ballots at the upcoming general election would violate the Help America Vote Act and state laws implementing the federal	The parties claimed that if the secretary's proposed procedure was allowed to occur, several voters who were members of the parties' respective organizations were likely to be disenfranchised. Defendants moved to transfer venue of the action to the Western District of Michigan claiming that the only proper	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				legislation. Defendants filed a motion to transfer venue.	venue for an action against a state official is the district that encompasses the state's seat of government. Alternatively, defendants sought transfer for the convenience of the parties and witnesses. The court found that defendants' arguments were not supported by the plain language of the current venue statutes. Federal actions against the Michigan secretary of state over rules and practices			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					governing federal elections traditionally were brought in both the Eastern and Western Districts of Michigan. There was no rule that required such actions to be brought only in the district in which the state's seat of government was located, and no inconvenience resulting from litigating in the state's more populous district reasonably could be claimed by a state official who had a			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					mandate to administer elections throughout the state and operated an office in each of its counties. Motion denied.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	347 F. Supp. 2d 404; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20872	October 19, 2004	Plaintiffs, voter organizations and political parties, filed actions against defendants, the Michigan Secretary of State and her director of elections, challenging directives issued to local election officials concerning the casting and tabulation of provisional ballots. Plaintiffs sought a	The court concluded that (1) plaintiffs had standing to assert their claims; (2) HAVA created individual rights enforceable through 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983; (3) Congress had provided a scheme under HAVA in which a voter's right to have a	No	N/A	No



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				preliminary injunction and contended that the directives violated their rights under the Help America Vote Act.	provisional ballot for federal offices tabulated was determined by state law governing eligibility, and defendants' directives for determining eligibility on the basis of precinct--based residency were inconsistent with state and federal election law; (4) Michigan election law defined voter qualifications in terms of the voter's home jurisdiction, and a person who cast a			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					provisional ballot within his or her jurisdiction was entitled under federal law to have his or her votes for federal offices counted if eligibility to vote in that election could be verified; and (5) defendants' directives concerning proof of identity of first-time voters who registered by mail were consistent with federal and state law.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
James v. Bartlett	Supreme Court of North Carolina	359 N.C. 260; 607 S.E.2d 638; 2005 N.C. LEXIS 146	February 4, 2005	Appellant candidates challenged elections in the superior court through appeals of election protests before the North Carolina State Board of Elections and a declaratory judgment action in the superior court. The court entered an order granting summary judgment in favor of appellees, the Board, the Board's executive director, the Board's members, and the North Carolina Attorney General. The candidates appealed.	The case involved three separate election challenges. The central issue was whether a provisional ballot cast on election day at a precinct other than the voter's correct precinct of residence could be lawfully counted in final election tallies. The superior court held that it could be counted. On appeal, the supreme court determined that state law did not permit out-of-precinct provisional	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots to be counted in state and local elections. The candidates failure to challenge the counting of out--of--precinct provisional ballots before the election did not render their action untimely. Reversed and remanded.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	387 F.3d 565; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 22320	October 26, 2004	Defendant state appealed from an order of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio which held that the Help America Vote Act required that voters be permitted to cast	The district court found that HAVA created an individual right to cast a provisional ballot, that this right is individually enforceable under 42	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				provisional ballots upon affirming their registration to vote in the county in which they desire to vote and that provisional ballots must be counted as valid ballots when cast in the correct county.	U.S.C.S. § 1983, and that plaintiffs unions and political parties had standing to bring a § 1983 action on behalf of Ohio voters. The court of appeals agreed that the political parties and unions had associational standing to challenge the state's provisional voting directive. Further, the court determined that HAVA was quintessentially about being able to cast a provisional			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

---

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballot but that the voter casts a provisional ballot at the peril of not being eligible to vote under state law; if the voter is not eligible, the vote will then not be counted. Accordingly, the court of appeals reversed the district court and held that "provisional" ballots cast in a precinct where a voter does not reside and which would be invalid under state law, are not required by the HAVA to be considered			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					legal votes. Affirmed in part and reversed in part.			
State ex rel. Mackey v. Blackwell	Supreme Court of Ohio	106 Ohio St. 3d 261; 2005 Ohio 4789; 834 N.E.2d 346; 2005 Ohio LEXIS 2074	September 28, 2005	Appellants, a political group and county electors who voted by provisional ballot, sought review of a judgment from the court of appeals which dismissed appellants' complaint, seeking a writ of mandamus to prevent appellees, the Ohio Secretary of State, a county board of elections, and the board's director, from disenfranchisement of provisional ballot voters.	The Secretary of State issued a directive to all Ohio county boards of elections, which specified that a signed affirmation statement was necessary for the counting of a provisional ballot in a presidential election. During the election, over 24,400 provisional ballots were cast in one county. The electors' provisional	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots were not counted. They, together with a political activist group, brought the mandamus action to compel appellants to prohibit the invalidation of provisional ballots and to notify voters of reasons for ballot rejections. Assorted constitutional and statutory law was relied on in support of the complaint. The trial court dismissed the complaint, finding that no clear legal right was established			



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under Ohio law and the federal claims could be adequately raised in an action under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983. On appeal, the Ohio Supreme Court held that dismissal was proper, as the complaint actually sought declaratory and injunctive relief, rather than mandamus relief. Further, election--contest actions were the exclusive remedy to challenge election results. An adequate remedy existed			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under § 1983 to raise the federal-law claims. Affirmed.			
Fla. Democratic Party v. Hood	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida	342 F. Supp. 2d 1073; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21720	October 21, 2004	Plaintiff political party sought injunctive relief under the Help America Vote Act, claiming that the election system put in place by defendant election officials violated HAVA because it did not allow provisional voting other than in the voter's assigned precinct. The officials moved for judgment on the pleadings.	The political party asserted that a prospective voter in a federal election had the right to cast a provisional ballot at a given polling place, even if the local officials asserted that the voter was at the wrong polling place; second, that voter had the right to have that vote counted in the election, if the voter otherwise	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					met all requirements of state law. The court noted that the right to vote was clearly protectable as a civil right, and a primary purpose of the HAVA was to preserve the votes of persons who had incorrectly been removed from the voting rolls, and thus would not be listed as voters at what would otherwise have been the correct polling place. The irreparable injury to a voter was easily sufficient to			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>outweigh any harm to the officials. Therefore, the court granted relief as to the first claim, allowing the unlisted voter to cast a provisional ballot, but denied relief as to the second claim, that the ballot at the wrong place must be counted if it was cast at the wrong place, because that result contradicted State law. The provisional ballot could only be counted if it</p>			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					was cast in the proper precinct under State law.			
League of Women Voters v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	340 F. Supp. 2d 823; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20926	October 20, 2004	Plaintiff organizations filed suit against defendant, Ohio's Secretary of State, claiming that a directive issued by the Secretary contravened the provisions of the Help America Vote Act. The Secretary filed a motion to dismiss.	The directive in question instructed election officials to issue provisional ballots to first-time voters who registered by mail but did not provide documentary identification at the polling place on election day. When submitting a provisional ballot, a first-time voter could identify himself by providing his driver's license number or the	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					last four digits of his social security number. If he did not know either number, he could provide it before the polls closed. If he did not do so, his provisional ballot would not be counted. The court held that the directive did not contravene the HAVA and otherwise established reasonable requirements for confirming the identity of first-time voters who registered to vote by mail because: (1) the			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					identification procedures were an important bulwark against voter misconduct and fraud; (2) the burden imposed on first--time voters to confirm their identity, and thus show that they were voting legitimately, was slight; and (3) the number of voters unable to meet the burden of proving their identity was likely to be very small. Thus, the balance of interests favored the directive,			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					even if the cost, in terms of uncounted ballots, was regrettable.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	386 F.3d 815; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 28765	October 23, 2004	Defendant Ohio Secretary of State challenged an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, which held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive 2004--33 violated the federal Help America Vote Act. In its order, the district court directed the Secretary to issue a revised directive that conformed to HAVA's requirements.	On appeal, the court held that the district court correctly ruled that the right to cast a provisional ballot in federal elections was enforceable under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 and that at least one plaintiff had standing to enforce that right in the district court. The court also held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive	No	N/A	No



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					2004--33 violated HAVA to the extent that it failed to ensure that any individual affirming that he or she was a registered voter in the jurisdiction in which he or she desired to vote and eligible to vote in a federal election was permitted to cast a provisional ballot. However, the district court erred in holding that HAVA required that a voter's provisional ballot be counted as a			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					valid ballot if it was cast anywhere in the county in which the voter resided, even if it was cast outside the precinct in which the voter resided.			
Hawkins v. Blunt	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21512	October 12, 2004	In an action filed by plaintiffs, voters and a state political party, contending that the provisional voting requirements of Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430 conflicted with and was preempted by the Help America Vote Act, plaintiffs and defendants, the secretary of state and others, moved	The court held that the text of the HAVA, as well as its legislative history, proved that it could be read to include reasonable accommodations of state precinct voting practices in implementing provisional voting requirements.	No	N/A	No

015438

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				for summary judgment.	The court further held that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430.2 was reasonable; to effectuate the HAVA's intent and to protect that interest, it could not be unreasonable to direct a voter to his correct voting place where a full ballot was likely to be cast. The court also held that plaintiffs' equal protection rights were not violated by the requirement that before a voter would be allowed to cast a provisional			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballot, the voter would first be directed to his proper polling place.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	340 F. Supp. 2d 802; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20551	October 13, 2004	Plaintiffs, state and county Democratic parties, filed an action against defendant, Michigan secretary of state and the Michigan director of elections, alleging that the state's intended procedure for casting and counting provisional ballots at the upcoming general election would violate the Help America Vote Act and state laws implementing the federal	The parties claimed that if the secretary's proposed procedure was allowed to occur, several voters who were members of the parties' respective organizations were likely to be disenfranchised. Defendants moved to transfer venue of the action to the Western District of Michigan claiming that the only proper	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				legislation. Defendants filed a motion to transfer venue.	venue for an action against a state official is the district that encompasses the state's seat of government. Alternatively, defendants sought transfer for the convenience of the parties and witnesses. The court found that defendants' arguments were not supported by the plain language of the current venue statutes. Federal actions against the Michigan secretary of state over rules and practices			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					governing federal elections traditionally were brought in both the Eastern and Western Districts of Michigan. There was no rule that required such actions to be brought only in the district in which the state's seat of government was located, and no inconvenience resulting from litigating in the state's more populous district reasonably could be claimed by a state official who had a			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					mandate to administer elections throughout the state and operated an office in each of its counties. Motion denied.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	347 F. Supp. 2d 404; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20872	October 19, 2004	Plaintiffs, voter organizations and political parties, filed actions against defendants, the Michigan Secretary of State and her director of elections, challenging directives issued to local election officials concerning the casting and tabulation of provisional ballots. Plaintiffs sought a	The court concluded that (1) plaintiffs had standing to assert their claims; (2) HAVA created individual rights enforceable through 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983; (3) Congress had provided a scheme under HAVA in which a voter's right to have a	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				preliminary injunction and contended that the directives violated their rights under the Help America Vote Act.	provisional ballot for federal offices tabulated was determined by state law governing eligibility, and defendants' directives for determining eligibility on the basis of precinct--based residency were inconsistent with state and federal election law; (4) Michigan election law defined voter qualifications in terms of the voter's home jurisdiction, and a person who cast a			



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Provisional Ballot Cases - 2

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					provisional ballot within his or her jurisdiction was entitled under federal law to have his or her votes for federal offices counted if eligibility to vote in that election could be verified; and (5) defendants' directives concerning proof of identity of first--time voters who registered by mail were consistent with federal and state law.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Hileman v. McGinness	Court of Appeals of Illinois, Fifth District	316 Ill. App. 3d 868; 739 N.E.2d 81; 2000 Ill. App. LEXIS 845	October 25, 2000	Appellant challenged the circuit court declaration that that the result of a primary election for county circuit clerk was void.	In a primary election for county circuit clerk, the parties agreed that 681 absentee ballots were presumed invalid. The ballots had been commingled with the valid ballots. There were no markings or indications on the ballots which would have allowed them to be segregated from other ballots cast. Because the ballots could not have been segregated, apportionment was the	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					appropriate remedy if no fraud was involved. If fraud was involved, the election would have had to have been voided and a new election held. Because the trial court did not hold an evidentiary hearing on the fraud allegations, and did not determine whether fraud was in issue, the case was remanded for a determination as to whether fraud was evident in			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the electoral process. The court reversed the declaration of the trial court, holding that a determination as to whether fraud was involved in the election was necessary to a determination of whether or not a new election was required.			
DeFabio v. Gummersheimer	Supreme Court of Illinois	192 Ill. 2d 63; 733 N.E.2d 1241; 2000 Ill. LEXIS 993	July 6, 2000	Appellant challenged the judgment of the appellate court, which affirmed the trial court's decision granting appellee's summary judgment motion in action brought by	Appellee filed a petition for election contest, alleging that the official results of the Monroe County coroners election were invalid because none of the 524 ballots cast in	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				appellee to contest the results of the election for the position of county coroner in Monroe County.	Monroe County's second precinct were initialed by an election judge, in violation of Illinois law. The trial court granted appellee's motion for summary judgment, and the appellate court affirmed the judgment. The Illinois supreme court affirmed, noting that statutes requiring election judges to initial election ballots were mandatory, and uninitialed			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots could not have been counted, even where the parties agreed that there was no knowledge of fraud or corruption. Thus, the supreme court held that the trial court properly invalidated all of the ballots cast in Monroe County's second precinct. The court reasoned that none of the ballots contained the requisite initialing, and neither party argued that any			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					of the uninitialed ballots could have been distinguished or identified as absentee ballots. The supreme court affirmed the judgment because the Illinois statute requiring election judges to initial election ballots was mandatory, and uninitialed ballots could not have been counted, even where the parties agreed that there was no knowledge of fraud or corruption.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					Additionally, none of the ballots in Monroe County's second precinct contained the requisite initialing.			
Gilmore v. Amityville Union Free Sch. Dist.	United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York	305 F. Supp. 2d 271; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3116	March 2, 2004	Plaintiffs, two school board candidates, filed a class action complaint against defendants, a school district, the board president, and other district agents or employees, challenging a school board election. Defendants moved to dismiss.	During the election, a voting machine malfunctioned, resulting in votes being cast on lines that were blank on the ballot. The board president devised a plan for counting the machine votes by moving each tally up one line. The two candidates, who were African	No	N/A	No



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

---

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					American, alleged that the president's plan eliminated any possibility that an African American would be elected. The court found that the candidates failed to state a claim under § 1983 because they could not show that defendants' actions were done or approved by a person with final policymaking authority, nor was there a showing of intentional or			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					purposeful discrimination on defendants' part. The vote-counting method applied equally to all candidates. The candidates' claims under § 2000a and 2000c--8 failed because schools were not places of public accommodation, as required under § 2000a, and § 2000c--8 applied to school segregation. Their claim under § 1971 of deprivation of voting rights failed because §			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					1971 did not provide for a private right of action. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over various state law claims. Defendants' motion to dismiss was granted with respect to the candidates' federal claims; the state law claims were dismissed without prejudice.			
State ex rel. Mackey v. Blackwell	Supreme Court of Ohio	106 Ohio St. 3d 261; 2005 Ohio	September 28, 2005	Appellants, a political group and county electors who voted by provisional ballot,	The Secretary of State issued a directive to all Ohio county boards of	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		4789; 834 N.E.2d 346; 2005 Ohio LEXIS 2074		sought review of a judgment from the court of appeals, which dismissed appellants' complaint, seeking a writ of mandamus to prevent appellees, the Ohio Secretary of State, a county board of elections, and the board's director, from disenfranchisement of provisional ballot voters.	elections, which specified that a signed affirmation statement was necessary for the counting of a provisional ballot in a presidential election. During the election, over 24,400 provisional ballots were cast in one county. The electors' provisional ballots were not counted. They, together with a political activist group, brought the mandamus action to compel			

015456

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>appellants to prohibit the invalidation of provisional ballots and to notify voters of reasons for ballot rejections. Assorted constitutional and statutory law was relied on in support of the complaint. The court dismissed the complaint, finding that no clear legal right was established under Ohio law and the federal claims could be adequately raised in an action under §</p>			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					1983. On appeal, the Ohio supreme court held that dismissal was proper, as the complaint actually sought declaratory and injunctive relief, rather than mandamus relief. Further, election--contest actions were the exclusive remedy to challenge election results. An adequate remedy existed under § 1983 to raise the federal--law claims. Affirmed.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Touchston v. McDermott	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida	120 F. Supp. 2d 1055; 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20091	November 14, 2000	In action in which plaintiffs, registered voters in Brevard County, Florida, filed suit against defendants, members of several County Canvassing Boards and the Secretary of the Florida Department of State, challenging the constitutionality of Fla. Stat. Ann. § 102.166(4) (2000), before the court was plaintiffs' emergency motion for temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction.	In their complaint, plaintiffs challenged the constitutionality of § 102.166(4), asserting that the statute violated their rights under the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of U.S. Const. amend. XIV. Based on these claims, plaintiffs sought an order from the court stopping the manual recount of votes. The court found that plaintiffs had failed to set forth a valid	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					basis for intervention by federal courts. They had not alleged that the Florida law was discriminatory, that citizens were being deprived of the right to vote, or that there had been fraudulent interference with the vote. Moreover, plaintiffs had not established a likelihood of success on the merits of their claims. Plaintiffs' motion for temporary restraining order and/or			



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					preliminary injunction denied; plaintiffs had not alleged that the Florida law was discriminatory, that citizens were being deprived of the right to vote, or that there had been fraudulent interference with the vote.			
Siegel v. LePore	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida	120 F. Supp. 2d 1041; 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16333	November 13, 2000	Plaintiffs, individual Florida voters and Republican Party presidential and vice-presidential candidates, moved for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction to	The court addressed who should consider plaintiffs' serious arguments that manual recounts would diminish the accuracy of vote counts due to ballot	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				enjoin defendants, canvassing board members from four Florida counties, from proceeding with manual recounts of election ballots.	degradation and the exercise of discretion in determining voter intent. The court ruled that intervention by a federal district court, particularly on a preliminary basis, was inappropriate. A federal court should not interfere except where there was an immediate need to correct a constitutional violation. Plaintiffs neither demonstrated a clear deprivation of a constitutional			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					injury or a fundamental unfairness in Florida's manual recount provision. The recount provision was reasonable and non--discriminatory on its face and resided within the state's broad control over presidential election procedures. Plaintiffs failed to show that manual recounts were so unreliable as to constitute a constitutional injury, that plaintiffs'			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					alleged injuries were irreparable, or that they lacked an adequate state court remedy. Injunctive relief denied because plaintiffs demonstrated neither clear deprivation of constitutional injury or fundamental unfairness in Florida's manual recount provision to justify federal court interference in state election procedures.			
Gore v. Harris	Supreme Court of	773 So. 2d 524;	December 22, 2000	In a contest to results of the 2000	The state supreme court	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Florida	2000 Fla. LEXIS 2474		presidential election in Florida, the United States Supreme Court reversed and remanded a Florida Supreme Court decision that had ordered a manual recount of certain ballots.	had ordered the trial court to conduct a manual recount of 9000 contested Miami--Dade County ballots, and also held that uncounted "undervotes" in all Florida counties were to be manually counted. The trial court was ordered to use the standard that a vote was "legal" if there was a clear indication of the intent of the voter. The United States Supreme Court released an			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>opinion on December 12, 2000, which held that such a standard violated equal protection rights because it lacked specific standards to ensure equal application, and also mandated that any manual recount would have to have been completed by December 12, 2000. On remand, the state supreme court found that it was impossible under that time frame to adopt adequate</p>			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					standards and make necessary evaluations of vote tabulation equipment. Also, development of a specific, uniform standard for manual recounts was best left to the legislature. Because adequate standards for a manual recount could not be developed by the deadline set by the United States Supreme Court, appellants were afforded no relief.			
Goodwin v. St.	Territorial	43 V.I.	December	Plaintiff political	Plaintiff alleged	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Thomas--St. John Bd. of Elections	Court of the Virgin Islands	89; 2000 V.I. LEXIS 15	13, 2000	candidate alleged that certain general election absentee ballots violated territorial election law, and that the improper inclusion of such ballots by defendants, election board and supervisor, resulted in plaintiff's loss of the election. Plaintiff sued defendants seeking invalidation of the absentee ballots and certification of the election results tabulated without such ballots.	that defendants counted unlawful absentee ballots that lacked postmarks, were not signed or notarized, were in unsealed and/or torn envelopes, and were in envelopes containing more than one ballot. Prior to tabulation of the absentee ballots, plaintiff was leading intervenor for the final senate position, but the absentee ballots entitled intervenor to the position. The			



EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

---

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					court held that plaintiff was not entitled to relief since he failed to establish that the alleged absentee voting irregularities would require invalidation of a sufficient number of ballots to change the outcome of the election. While the unsealed ballots constituted a technical violation, the outer envelopes were sealed and thus substantially complied with election			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					requirements. Further, while defendants improperly counted one ballot where a sealed ballot envelope and a loose ballot were in the same outer envelope, the one vote involved did not change the election result. Plaintiff's other allegations of irregularities were without merit since ballots without postmarks were valid, ballots without signatures were not counted, and			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots without notarized signatures were proper. Plaintiffs request for declaratory and injunctive relief was denied. Invalidation of absentee ballots was not required since the irregularities asserted by plaintiff involved ballots which were in fact valid, were not tabulated by defendants, or were insufficient to change the outcome of the election.			
Shannon v.	United	394 F.3d	January 7,	Plaintiffs, voters	Local election	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research  
Ballot Counting Violation Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Jacobowitz	States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit	90; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 259	2005	and an incumbent candidate, sued defendants, a challenger candidate, a county board of election, and commissioners, pursuant to § 1983 alleging violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States District Court for the Northern District of New York granted summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs. Defendants appealed.	inspectors noticed a problem with a voting machine. Plaintiffs asserted that their votes were not counted due to the machine malfunction. Rather than pursue the state remedy of quo warranto, by requesting that New York's Attorney General investigate the machine malfunction and challenge the election results in state court, plaintiffs filed their complaint in federal court.			